

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed August 2, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 14 – 16 and 18 – 20 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 9, 12, 16 and 18, and have canceled claim 5 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer.

Applicants have canceled claim 5 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 and 5 - 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Scorse*. With respect to claim 5, Applicants have canceled this claim and respectfully assert that the rejection as to this claim has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In this regard, *Scorse* relates to an image transmission system in which a user can selectively segment and compress image data for transmission. Such a system is highly manual in nature, in that the user must specifically designate which portions of the data are to be segmented and/or compressed. Notably, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Scorse* of a system in which image data is stored at multiple levels of resolution, with the image data being automatically provided to the user at a different resolution based on the manner in which that data is to be used. That is, *Scorse* does not address as system in which the image data is provided to a user in a different manner depending upon whether the image data is to

be viewed as video images or still images. This is in direct contrast to the limitations recited in Applicants' amended claims.

In this regard, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

1. A method for providing digital video images and still images comprising:
 - providing sequential frames of image data to a user for rendering as video images, the video images being configured for providing at a first resolution, at least some of the image data being stored at a second resolution higher than the first resolution;
 - responsive to a user input corresponding to viewing the image data as video images, automatically converting at least some of the image data configured with the second resolution such that the frames provided to the user for rendering as video images are configured with the first resolution;***
 - displaying the sequential frames of image data as video images at the first resolution;
 - receiving a request for image data corresponding to one of the video images; and
 - providing image data corresponding to the requested one of the video images to the user at the second resolution such that a still image corresponding to the requested one of the video images is obtained at the second higher resolution.***

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be removed and that claim 1 be placed in condition for allowance. Since claims 6 - 11 are dependent claims that incorporate the features/limitations of claim 1, and are not otherwise rejected, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features and combination thereof that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to claim 12, that claim has been amended to recite:

12. An imaging system comprising:
a video/still imaging system configured to provide frames of image data to a user for rendering as video images of a first resolution, said video/still imaging system storing at least some of the frames of image data at a higher, second resolution,
wherein said video/still imaging system compresses image data configured with the second resolution such that *image data provided to the user for rendering as video images is automatically configured with the first resolution, responsive to a user request to display the image data as video images;*
said video/still imaging system being further configured to receive a request for image data corresponding to one of the frames of image data such that, in response thereto, said video/still imaging system automatically provides image data corresponding to the requested one of the frames to the user for rendering as a still image, the still image being configured with the second resolution.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 12. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 be removed and that claim 12 be placed in condition for allowance. Since claims 14 and 15 are dependent claims that incorporate the features/limitations of claim 12, and are not otherwise rejected, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features and combination thereof that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to claim 16, that claim has been amended to recite:

16. An imaging system comprising:
an image data storage medium having sequential frames of image data stored thereon, said frames being configured to be automatically provided to a user for rendering as video images, responsive to a user request to view the image data as video images, the video images being configured for providing at a first resolution;
at least some of said sequential frames being configured to be provided to the user for rendering as still images, *the still images being configured to be automatically provided at a second resolution, responsive to a user*

request to view the image data as still images, the second resolution being higher than the first resolution such that, when the user is viewing the image data as video images and requests to view an image corresponding to one of the video images as a still image, the second resolution image data is automatically provided, thereby providing the user with higher resolution image data than that provided by the video images.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 16. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be removed and that claim 16 be placed in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 18, that claim has been amended to recite:

18. A computer readable medium having a computer program for providing digital video images and still images, said computer readable medium comprising:

logic configured to enable sequential frames of image data to be automatically provided to a user for rendering as video images, the video images being configured for providing at a first resolution despite at least some of the sequential frames of image data being stored at a higher, second resolution;

logic configured to receive a request for image data corresponding to one of the sequential frames of image data; and

logic configured to enable image data corresponding to the requested one of the sequential frames to be provided to the user for rendering as a still image, the still image being configured for providing at the second resolution such that, when the user is viewing the sequential frames as video images and requests to view one of the sequential frames as a still image, the second resolution image data is automatically provided, thereby providing the user with higher resolution image data than that provided by the video images.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 18. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that *Scorse* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 be removed and that claim 18 be placed in condition for allowance. Since claims 19 and 20 are dependent claims

that incorporate the features/limitations of claim 18, and are not otherwise rejected, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features and combination thereof that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action indicates that claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scorse* in view of *Heirich*, and that claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scorse* in view of *Geshwind*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. In particular, claims 3 and 4 are dependent claims that incorporate the features/limitations of claim 1, the allowability of which is discussed above. Since neither *Heirich* nor *Geshwind* teach or reasonably suggest the limitations that are described above as lacking in *Scorse*, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is improper and that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features and combination thereof that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.


Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.


Respectfully submitted,



David R. Risley, Reg. No. 39,345

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 10/13/05.



Signature